REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16 and 19 are active in this application.

Claim 16 is amended to define a mixture of ethoxylates of C_{4-6} -alkylglycols -or diglycols which, on average, have a degree of ethoxylation of from 1 to 8 based on the C_{4-6} alkylglycols or -diglycols and dihydroxyalkynes or derivatives. Support is found in original Claim 1 and the specification, e.g., at page 6, lines 22-23.

No new matter is believed to have been added by these amendments.

To the maintained rejection based on Evers, Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection based on the amendment submitted for Claim 16 because Evers does not describe in amended claim 16, a mixture of ethoxylates of C₄₋₆-alkylglycols -or diglycols which, on average, have a degree of ethoxylation of from 1 to 8 based on the C₄₋₆ alkylglycols or -diglycols and dihydroxyalkynes or derivatives

Evers disclose a mixture comprising a surfactant being based on a C₁₁-C₂₄-alkyl chain, in combination with a co-surfactant, being based on a C₆-C₁₀-alkyl chain. Suitable surfactants are, for example, alkyl sulfates, alkyl ether sulfates, alkyl sulfonates, alkyl succinates, alkyl carboxylates, alkyl ether carboxylates, alkyl sarcosinates, alkyl sulfosuccinates, amine oxides, glucose amides, alkyl polysaccharides, alkyl alkoxylates and betaines (See page 3, lines 1 to 8 of Evers). Both, the long alkyl chain surfactant and the short alkyl chain surfactant are chosen from these kinds of surfactants.

Evers do not describe nor does Evers point in the direction that dihydroxyakynes or derivatives thereof are combined with C₄₋₆-alkyl glycols or —diglycols having a degree of ethoxylation of from 1 to 8.

Therefore, the claims are not anticipated by Evers.

Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2008.

The advantages obtained from this specific mixture are shown in example 2 on pages

13 and 14 of the description of the present application. Example 2 shows that the specific

mixture of Claim 16 makes it possible to achieve an interfacial tension of 43 mN/m in only

0.2 seconds (formulation B) whereas comparative formulation (A) with the same composition

but for cumene sulphonate used in place of hexyl glycol ethoxylate with a degree of

ethoxylation of 4. Formulation A in equilibrium yielded an interfacial tension of 50 mN/m

after 0.5 seconds.

This Example shows that formulation B (as in the claims) has advantages over

formulation A in its static and dynamic properties.

The paper finishing example on pages 14-15 shows that the inventive alkylglycol

alkoxylates significantly improve the uniformity of an image that is printed on a treated paper

(as outlined in the table on page 15).

Thus, the claims would not have been obvious in view of Evers.

Withdrawal of the rejection based on Evers is requested.

A Notice of Allowance is requested for all pending claims. Should the Examiner

deem that any further action is required to place this application in even better form for

allowance, he is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.

Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)